arXiv:1107.1489v2 [math.GR] 8 May 2012

THE COMPUTATIONAL COMPLEXITY OF RECOGNISING EMBEDDINGS, AND A UNIVERSAL FINITELY PRESENTED TORSION-FREE GROUP

MAURICE CHIODO

Abstract. We extend a result by Lempp that recognising torsion-freeness for finitely presented groups is Π_2^0-complete; we show that the problem of recognising embeddings of finitely presented groups is at least Π_2^0-hard, Σ_2^0-hard, and lies in Σ_3^0. We conjecture that this problem is indeed Σ_3^0-complete. We give a uniform construction that, on input of a recursive presentation of a group P, outputs a recursive presentation $P^{\text{tor-free}}$ of a torsion-free group, which is isomorphic to P whenever P is itself torsion-free. We apply our constructions to form a universal finitely presented torsion-free group.

1. Introduction

A finite presentation $\langle X|R\rangle$ of a group is a finite collection of generators X, together with a finite set R of defining relations. The independent work of Boone, Britton and Novikov [2, 6, 18] gave the first examples of constructions which realise incomputable sets in finitely presented groups. This was achieved by incorporating the action of a Turing machine into a finite presentation. However, these early constructions showed only that certain problems in group theory were incomputable (i.e., Σ_1^0-hard), but not any higher level of complexity in the arithmetic hierarchy (see [21], or the introduction to [15], for a description of Σ_n^0 sets, Π_n^0 sets, and Kleene's arithmetic hierarchy).

It is known (see [17]) that the problem of recognising each of the following properties amongst finitely presented groups is Σ_1^0-complete: trivial, abelian, finite, free, nilpotent, polycyclic, automatic. Boone and Rogers [4] showed that having solvable word problem is Σ_3^0-complete. More recently, Papasoglu [20] has shown that being word hyperbolic is Σ_1^0-complete.

In [15] it was shown by Lempp that the problem of recognising torsion-freeness for finitely presented groups is Π_2^0-complete. In [8] we showed that there exists a finitely presented group whose finitely presented subgroups are not recursively enumerable. In this paper we expand on the techniques we established in [8] to extend the result by Lempp, and show the following:

2010 *AMS Classification:* 20F10, 03D40, 03D80.

Keywords: Finitely presented groups, embeddings, Kleene's arithmetical hierarchy, decision problems, universal quotients, universal finitely presented group.

The author was supported by: an Australian Postgraduate Award, and a University of Melbourne Overseas Research Experience Scholarship.

Date: May 9, 2012.

Theorem 3.6. *Take an enumeration $P_1, P_2, \dots$ of all finite presentations of groups, and use $\langle i, j \rangle$ to denote* Cantor's pairing function*; a computable bijection from $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ to $\mathbb{N}$. Then the set $K = \{\langle i, j \rangle \in \mathbb{N} \mid P_i \text{ embeds in } P_j, \text{ as groups}\}$ is Σ_2^0-hard, Π_2^0-hard, has a Σ_3^0 description, and we conjecture to be Σ_3^0-complete.*

A recursive presentation $\langle X | R \rangle$ of a group is a finite collection of generators X, together with a recursive enumeration of a (possibly infinite) set R of defining relations. The Higman embedding theorem [14] shows that every recursively presented group embeds into a finitely presented group. Moreover, this embedding can be made *uniform*; there is an algorithm that takes a recursive presentation P and outputs a finite presentation Q and an explicit embedding $\phi : P \hookrightarrow Q$. Theorem 3.6 is developed from the following main technical result of this paper: that the Higman embedding theorem can strictly preserve the orders of torsion elements.

Theorem 2.5. *There is a uniform procedure that, on input of a countably generated recursive presentation P, constructs a finite presentation $\mathrm{T}(P)$ such that the group P embeds in the group $\mathrm{T}(P)$, and an explicit embedding $\phi : P \hookrightarrow \mathrm{T}(P)$. Moreover, for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the group P has an element of order k if and only if the group $\mathrm{T}(P)$ has an element of order k.*

We note that Collins [11], extending the work of Clapham [9, 10], has shown that the Higman embedding theorem can be made to simultaneously preserve the Turing degree of the word problem, order problem, and power problem (see [21] for an introduction to Turing degrees). However, this does not immediately imply that the orders of torsion elements are preserved under the embedding.

Every group G has a unique torsion-free quotient through which all other torsion-free quotients factor; we call this the *torsion-free universal quotient* $G^{\text{tor-free}}$. By carefully considering the behaviour of recursively presented torsion-free groups, we give the following construction:

Theorem 4.13. *There is a uniform procedure that, on input of a countably generated recursive presentation $P = \langle X | R \rangle$ of a group, outputs a countably generated recursive presentation $P^{\text{tor-free}} = \langle X | R' \rangle$ (on the same generating set X, and with $R \subseteq R'$) of the torsion-free universal quotient of P.*

The Higman embedding theorem was used by Higman to show the existence of a *universal* finitely presented group; one in which all finitely presented groups embed. By combining the above two results, we make the following remarkable extension to this fact, which also strengthens the result from [8] on non-enumerablilty of subgroups.

Theorem 5.8. *There is a universal finitely presented torsion-free group G. That is, G is torsion-free, and for any finitely presented group H we have that $H \hookrightarrow G$ if and only if H is torsion-free. Hence the set of finite presentations defining subgroups of G is Π_2^0-complete.*

In actual fact, G (as described above) can be made to have an embedded copy of every countably generated recursively presentable torsion-free group, and still be finitely presentable.

Acknowledgements: The author wishes to thank Steffen Lempp for his useful insight and comments on this work, Andrew Glass for his many thought-provoking conversations, Rishi Vyas for his suggestion to generalise these results and his specific contributions in parts, Chuck Miller and Jack Button for their helpful comments on improving this work. Many thanks must also go to the late Greg Hjorth, whose suggestion of making contact with Steffen led to the eventual writing of this work.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notation.** We take φ_m to be the m^{th} *partial recursive function* $\varphi_m : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, and the m^{th} *partial recursive set* (r.e. set) W_m as the domain of φ_m. If $P = \langle X | R \rangle$ is a group presentation with generating set X and relators R, then we denote by $\overline{P}$ the group presented by P. A presentation $P = \langle X | R \rangle$ is said to be a *recursive presentation* if X is a finite set and R is a recursive enumeration of relators; P is said to be a *countably generated recursive presentation* if instead X is a recursive enumeration of generators. A group G is said to be *finitely* (resp. *recursively*) *presentable* if $G \cong \overline{P}$ for some finite (resp. recursive) presentation P. If P, Q are group presentations then we denote their free product presentation by $P * Q$, given by taking the disjoint union of their generators and relators; this extends to the free product of arbitrary collections of presentations. If X is a set, then we denote by X^{-1} a set of the same cardinality as X (considered an 'inverse' set to X) along with a fixed bijection $\phi : X \to X^{-1}$, where we denote $x^{-1} := \phi(x)$. We write X^* for the set of finite words on $X \cup X^{-1}$, including the empty word $\emptyset$. If $\phi : X \to Y^*$ is a set map, then we write $\overline{\phi} : X^* \to Y^*$ for the extension of ϕ. If $g_1, \dots, g_n$ are a collection of elements of a group G, then we write $\langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle^G$ for the subgroup in G generated by these elements, and $\langle\langle g_1, \dots, g_n \rangle\rangle^G$ for the normal closure of these elements in G. A group G is said to be be *Hopfian* if any surjective homomorphism $f : G \twoheadrightarrow G$ is necessarily injective. If ρ is an algebraic property of groups, then we write ρ–grp for the class of groups with property ρ, and we write $G \in \rho$–grp to mean that G has property ρ. *Cantor's pairing function* is given by $\langle ., . \rangle : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$, $\langle x, y \rangle := \frac{1}{2}(x+y)(x+y+1)+y$ which is a computable bijection. An introduction to the relevant concepts in recursion theory, including Π_n^0 and Σ_n^0 sets, can be found in [21] or the introduction to [15].

2.2. **Embedding theorems.**

Definition 2.1. Let G be a group. We let $|g|$ denote the order of a group element g, and say g is *torsion* if $1 \leq |g| < \infty$. We then define the sets

$$\text{Tor}(G) := \{ g \in G \mid g \text{ is torsion} \}$$

and

$$\mathrm{TorOrd}(G) \coloneqq \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid \exists g \in \mathrm{Tor}(G) \text{ with } |g| = n \geq 2\}$$

Thus $\mathrm{Tor}(G)$ is the set of torsion elements of G, and $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G)$ is the set of orders of non-trivial torsion elements of G (note that $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G)$ never contains 0 or 1). G is said to be *torsion-free* if $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G) = \varnothing$.

We begin with the following three results found in [22] as Theorem 11.69, Corollary 11.72, and Theorem 12.18 respectively.

Theorem 2.2 ([22, Theorem 11.69] Torsion theorem for amalgamated products and HNN extensions)**.**
Let $g \in G$ have finite order in G. Then:
1. *If $G = K_1 *_H K_2$ is an amalgamated product, then g is conjugate to an element of K_1 or K_2. Hence* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(K_1 *_H K_2) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(K_1) \cup \mathrm{TorOrd}(K_2)$.
2. *If $G = K*_H$ is an HNN extension, then g is conjugate to an element in the base group K. Hence* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(K*_H) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(K)$.

We note that in [19] Osin uses the notation $\pi(G)$ to denote $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G)$; there does not seem to be any consistent notation in the literature for this.

Lemma 2.3 ([22, Corollary 11.72])**.** *Let G be a countable group with generator and relator sets that are recursively enumerable (i.e., G has a countably generated recursive presentation). Then G can be uniformly embedded into some 2-generator recursively presentable group E such that* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(E)$.

Theorem 2.4 (Higman [22, Theorem 12.18])**.** *Let G be a (finitely generated) recursively presentable group. Then G can be uniformly embedded into some finitely presentable group H such that* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(H)$.

In the proofs of lemma 2.3 and theorem 2.4 as found in [22], each group so constructed is built up from amalgamated products and HNN extensions, beginning with G and some finitely generated free groups. Hence, by theorem 2.2, $\mathrm{TorOrd}(G) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(E) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(H)$. We note that no mention of TorOrd (or any related notion) was made in [22, Theorem 12.18]; the observation about preservation of torsion is our own.

The above machinery is used to prove the following theorem, which will become the cornerstone of the main results contained herein.

Theorem 2.5. *There is a uniform procedure that, on input of a countably generated recursive presentation $P = \langle X|R\rangle$, constructs a finite presentation $\mathrm{T}(P)$ such that $\overline{P} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{T}(P)}$ and $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{P}) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{\mathrm{T}(P)})$, along with an explicit map ϕ which extends to an embedding $\overline{\phi} : \overline{P} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{T}(P)}$.*

Proof. Given a countably generated recursive presentation P, we use lemma 2.3 to uniformly construct a 2-generator recursive presentation H with $\overline{P} \hookrightarrow \overline{H}$ and $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{H}) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{P})$, and theorem 2.4 to uniformly construct a finite presentation $\mathrm{T}(P)$ with $\overline{H} \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{T}(P)}$ and $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{P}) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{H}) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{\mathrm{T}(P)})$. As all stages in this construction have been uniform, we conclude that such a presentation $\mathrm{T}(P)$ can be uniformly constructed from P. □

We note that Collins [11], extending the work of Clapham [9, 10], has shown that an embedding such as in theorem 2.4 can be made to simultaneously preserve the Turing degree of the word problem, order problem, and power problem (see [21] for an introduction to Turing degrees). However, this does not immediately imply that TorOrd is preserved under the embedding, or even many-one equivalent. In addition, Osin [19] proved the following embedding result.

Theorem 2.6 (Osin [19, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Any countable group G can be embedded into a 2-generator group C such that any two elements in C of the same order are conjugate in C, and* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(C) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(G)$.

We note that C so constructed above cannot always be made to be recursively presentable, even on input of a finitely presentable group (as pointed out to the author by Denis Osin). For suppose it could. Then take a finitely presentable torsion-free group G with unsolvable word problem (see [17, Theorem 2.3]), and suppose there was a C as above which was recursively presentable. Then C will have precisely 2 conjugacy classes, and so will be a recursively presentable simple group, and hence have solvable word problem (see [17, Theorem 6.2]). But G is a subgroup of C with unsolvable word problem, a contradiction.

Though we rely heavily on theorem 2.5 later on, we note that is was originally used in [8] to show the following:

Theorem 2.7 (Chiodo [8, Lemma 6.11])**.** *There is a uniform procedure than, on input of any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, constructs a finite presentation Q_n such that* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{Q_n})$ *is one-one equivalent to $\mathbb{N} \setminus W_n$. Taking n' with $W_{n'}$ non-recursive thus gives that* $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{Q_{n'}})$ *is not recursively enumerable; thus the finitely presentable subgroups of $\overline{Q_{n'}}$ are not recursively enumerable.*

3. Complexity Results

Our initial motivation was to investigate if the finitely presentable subgroups of a finitely presentable group always form a recursively enumerable set. This was done in [8], and follows from theorem 2.7.

Theorem 3.1 (Chiodo [8, Theorem 6.8])**.** *There exists a finitely presentable group G such that the set of all finite presentations that define groups which embed into G is not recursively enumerable.*

Using the machinery described in section 2, we can encode the following recursion theory facts (found in [21]) into groups.

Lemma 3.2 ([21, §13.3 Theorem VIII])**.** *The set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid W_n = \mathbb{N}\}$ is Π_2^0-complete; the set $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid |W_n| < \infty\}$ is Σ_2^0-complete.*

Our existing observations immediately recover the following result, first proved in [15, Main Theorem] by Lempp.

Theorem 3.3. *The set of finite presentations of torsion-free groups is Π_2^0-complete.*

Proof. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use theorem 2.7 to construct a finite presentation Q_n such that $\mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{Q_n})$ is one-one equivalent to $\mathbb{N} \setminus W_n$. Thus $\overline{Q_n}$ is torsion-free if and only if $W_n = \mathbb{N}$. From lemma 3.2, $\{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid W_n = \mathbb{N}\}$ is Π^0_2-complete, so the set of torsion-free finite presentations is at least Π^0_2-hard. But this set has the following Π^0_2 description (taken from [15]):

$$G \text{ is torsion-free if and only if } \forall w \in G \forall n > 0 (w^n \neq_G e \text{ or } w =_G e)$$

and hence is Π^0_2-complete. □

Before proceeding, we must show that given an index n with W_n finite, we can recursively construct an index n' with $W_{n'} = \{0, \dots, |W_n| - 1\}$.

Lemma 3.4. *There is a recursive function* $h : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$ *satisfying the following:*
1. *If* $W_n = \varnothing$ *then* $W_{h(n)} = \varnothing$.
2. *If* $1 \leq |W_n| < \infty$ *then* $W_{h(n)} = \{0, \dots, |W_n| - 1\}$.
3. *If* $|W_n| = \infty$ *then* $W_{h(n)} = \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. Given n, we begin an enumeration of W_n. For each element enumerated into W_n we increase the size of $W_{h(n)}$ by 1, by adding the next smallest integer not already in $W_{h(n)}$. If $W_n = \varnothing$ then $W_{h(n)} = \varnothing$. If $1 \leq |W_n| < \infty$, then $W_{h(n)} = \{0, \dots, |W_n| - 1\}$. If $|W_n| = \infty$ then we will continue to sequentially enumerate elements of $\mathbb{N}$ into $W_{h(n)}$, so $W_{h(n)} = \mathbb{N}$. As this is an effective description of $W_{h(n)}$, we have that h is recursive. □

A similar construction to the proof of theorem 2.7 (as found in [8, Lemma 6.11]) gives us the following:

Theorem 3.5. *For any fixed prime p, the set of finite presentations into which* C_p *embeds is* Σ^0_2*-complete.*

Proof. With h as in lemma 3.4, given n we form the countably generated recursive presentation P_n as follows:

$$P_n := \langle x_0, x_1, \dots \mid x_i^p = e \ \forall \ i, \ x_j = e \ \forall \ j \in W_{h(n)} \rangle$$

If $|W_n| < \infty$ then $|W_{h(n)}| < \infty$ and hence $\overline{P}_n \cong C_p * C_p * C_p * \dots$ On the other hand, if $|W_n| = \infty$ then $W_{h(n)} = \mathbb{N}$ and hence $\overline{P}_n \cong \{e\}$. So

$$\operatorname{TorOrd}(\overline{P}_n) = \begin{cases} \{p\} & \text{if } |W_n| < \infty \\ \varnothing & \text{if } |W_n| = \infty \end{cases}$$

That is, $C_p \hookrightarrow \overline{P}_n$ if and only if $|W_n| < \infty$. Now use theorem 2.5 to construct a finite presentation $\mathrm{T}(P_n)$ such that $\overline{P}_n \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{T}(P_n)}$ with $\operatorname{TorOrd}(\overline{P}_n) = \operatorname{TorOrd}(\overline{\mathrm{T}(P_n)})$. Hence $C_p \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{T}(P_n)}$ if and only if $|W_n| < \infty$, so by lemma 3.2 the set of finite presentations into which C_p embeds is Σ^0_2-hard. But this set has the following straightforward Σ^0_2 description:

$$C_p \hookrightarrow G \text{ if and only if } \exists w \in G (w \neq_G e \text{ and } w^p =_G e)$$

and hence is Σ^0_2-complete. □

We will later see, in theorem 5.8, that there is a group whose finitely presentable subgroups form a Π^0_2-complete set; combining this with the above theorem gives the following:

Theorem 3.6. *Take an enumeration $P_1, P_2, \ldots$ of all finite presentations of groups; $P_i = \langle X_i | R_i \rangle$. Then the set $K = \{\langle i, j\rangle \in \mathbb{N} \mid \overline{P_i} \hookrightarrow \overline{P_j}\}$ is Σ_2^0-hard, Π_2^0-hard, and has a Σ_3^0 description.*

Proof. Theorem 5.8 shows that K is Π_2^0-hard (note that this does not create a circular argument as we do not use theorem 3.6 again in this paper). Theorem 3.5 shows that K is Σ_2^0-hard, and the following is a Σ_3^0 description for K:

$$K = \{\langle i, j\rangle \in \mathbb{N} \mid (\exists \phi : X_i \to X_j^*)(\forall w \in X_i^*)(\overline{\phi}(w) =_{\overline{P_j}} e \text{ if and only if } w =_{\overline{P_i}} e)\}$$

$\square$

Based on the above, we conjecture the following:

Conjecture 1. The set K defined above is Σ_3^0-complete. That is, the problem of deciding for finite presentations P_i, P_j if $\overline{P_i} \hookrightarrow \overline{P_j}$ is Σ_3^0-complete.

Further work. The positions of the following properties in the arithmetic hierarchy have not been fully determined:

1. *Solvable*: Known to have a Σ_3^0 description.
2. *Residually finite*: Known to have a Π_2^0 description.
3. *Simple*: Known to have a Π_2^0 description.
4. *Orderable*: Known to have a Π_3^0 description (the Ohnishi condition).
5. *Right orderable*: Known to have a Π_3^0 description (the Ohnishi condition).

Points 1–3 are mentioned in [17, p. 20], while points 4–5 appear in [12, Lemma 2.2.1 and Lemma 2.2.2]. We note that it may very well be the case that some of these are neither Π_n^0-complete nor Σ_n^0-complete, for any n.

4. Universal quotients

Consider the abelianisation G^{ab} of a group G, and all its 'universal' properties: G^{ab} is a quotient of the original group, all maps from G to an abelian group factor through G^{ab}, and G^{ab} is unique up to isomorphism. With this in mind, we suggest the following definition:

Definition 4.1. Let ρ be an algebraic property of groups. If G is a group, then we say that a group H is a *ρ universal quotient* of G if the following hold:

1. $H \in \rho$–grp.
2. There is an associated surjection $h : G \twoheadrightarrow H$.
3. If $K \in \rho$–grp and $f : G \to K$ is a homomorphism, then f factors through h. That is, there is a map $\phi : H \to K$ such that $f = \phi \circ h : G \to K$.

This is best expressed with the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd} G \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[dr, "f"'] & H \arrow[d, "\phi"] \\ & K \end{tikzcd}$$

We begin by observing that if $G \in \rho$–grp, then a ρ universal quotient of G must be G itself.

Proposition 4.2. *If ρ is a property of groups with $G \in \rho$–grp, and H is a ρ universal quotient of G with associated surjection $h : G \twoheadrightarrow H$, then $G \cong H$ via h.*

Proof. As $G \in \rho$–grp, there exists some $\phi : H \to G$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G \arrow[r, "h"] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{id}_G"'] & H \arrow[d, "\phi"] \\
 & G
\end{tikzcd}$$

So we have that $\phi \circ h = \mathrm{id}_G : G \to G$. Hence h must be injective, and since it is surjective by definition, it follows that h is indeed an isomorphism. □

We see that ρ universal quotients are necessarily unique.

Proposition 4.3. *If H_1, H_2 are both ρ universal quotients for G, with associated surjections h_1, h_2, then $H_1 \cong H_2$. Moreover, not only can h_1, h_2 both be viewed as maps from G to H_1 (as $H_1 \cong H_2$), but they differ by an automorphism: there is some $\gamma \in \mathrm{Aut}(H_1)$ such that $h_1 = \gamma \circ h_2 : G \to H_1$.*

Proof. As $H_1, H_2 \in \rho$–grp, there exists $\phi : H_1 \to H_2$ and $\psi : H_2 \to H_1$ such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
G \arrow[r, "h_1"] \arrow[dr, "h_2"'] & H_1 \arrow[d, shift left, "\phi"] \\
 & H_2 \arrow[u, shift left, "\psi"]
\end{tikzcd}$$

So we have that:
1. $\psi \circ h_2 = h_1 : G \twoheadrightarrow H_1$.
2. $\phi \circ h_1 = h_2 : G \twoheadrightarrow H_2$.

Thus $h_2 = \phi \circ h_1 = \phi \circ \psi \circ h_2 : G \twoheadrightarrow H_2$, and similarly $h_1 = \psi \circ h_2 = \psi \circ \phi \circ h_1 : G \twoheadrightarrow H_1$. So $\phi \circ \psi : H_2 \to H_2$ is the identity homomorphism, as is $\psi \circ \phi : H_1 \to H_1$ (this follows since both h_1 and h_2 are surjective maps from G onto H_1 and H_2 respectively). So $H_1 \cong H_2$. Moreover, ψ and ϕ are an inverse pair of automorphisms of H_1, thus proving the second part. □

Definition 4.4. If ρ is an algebraic property of groups which always admits universal quotients, then we denote by G^ρ the (unique) ρ universal quotient for G.

Note. Proposition 4.3 shows that G^ρ is uniquely defined up to isomorphism (if it exists), and proposition 4.2 shows that $(G^\rho)^\rho \cong G^\rho$.

The following connection was pointed out to the author by Rishi Vyas.

Remark. In the language of category theory, if an algebraic property ρ always admits universal quotients, then this means that the forgetful functor $U : \boldsymbol{\rho} - \mathbf{Grp} \to \mathbf{Grp}$ (from the category of ρ-groups $\boldsymbol{\rho} - \mathbf{Grp}$ to the category of groups $\mathbf{Grp}$) admits a left adjoint $F \dashv U$, with $F : \mathbf{Grp} \to \boldsymbol{\rho} - \mathbf{Grp}$ being the functor that takes a group and maps it to its ρ universal quotient.

As an initial example, every group G has an abelian universal quotient. This is known as the abelianisation G^{ab} (In this case, and at other times later on, we will use a suitable abbreviation for ρ when writing the ρ universal quotient G^{ρ} for a group G. For example, writing G^{ab} for G^{abelian}). We investigate other such properties which admit universal quotients.

Definition 4.5. Given a group G, we define the *finite residual* of G to be the normal subgroup $R_G \coloneqq \bigcap_{i\in I} N_i$, where $\{N_i\}_{i\in I}$ is the collection of all finite index normal subgroups of G. A group G is said to be *residually finite* if $R_G = \{e\}$.

Proposition 4.6. *All groups have a residually finite universal quotient.*

Proof. It is immediate that the *residual quotient*, $G^{\mathrm{res}} \coloneqq G/R_G$, has all the desired properties of a residually finite universal quotient for G. ☐

Definition 4.7. We say a group G is *k-torsion* (or *of exponent k*) if all elements have order dividing k. That is, $g^k = e$ for all $g \in G$.

Proposition 4.8. *For any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, all groups have a k-torsion universal quotient.*

Proof. Define the set $S(G,k) \coloneqq \{g^k \mid g \in G\}$. Then the quotient $G^{\text{k-tor}} \coloneqq G/\langle\langle S(G,k)\rangle\rangle^G$ has all the desired properties of a k-torsion universal quotient for G. ☐

Remark. A long-standing open problem in group theory was whether all finitely generated k-torsion groups are finite; equivalently, whether $G^{\text{k-tor}}$ is finite for every finitely generated group G. This is known as the (*bounded*) *Burnside problem*, and has been resolved in the positive for $k \in \{1,2,3,4,6\}$. The case $k = 1$ is trivial, the case $k = 2$ is elementary group theory, and the cases $k = 3,4,6$ are shown in [13] Theorems 18.2.1, 18.3.1, 18.4.8. As every finitely generated group is a quotient of the free group F_n for some n, it immediately follows that one only needs to consider the universal k-torsion quotients of free groups, $F_n^{\text{k-tor}}$ (commonly referred to as the *free Burnside groups* $B(n,k)$ in the literature), and verify whether they are finite or not. This does not seem to simplify the problem much, as it is still unknown whether the group $B(2,5)$ is finite or not. Due to the work of Adian and Novikov [1], there are now known examples of infinite free Burnside groups. However, it is still unknown whether there exists an infinite, finitely presentable, k-torsion group.

More relevant to our work in this paper is the following:

Proposition 4.9. *All groups have a torsion-free universal quotient.*

Proof. Given a group G, we inductively define $\mathrm{Tor}_i(G)$ as follows: $\mathrm{Tor}_1(G) \coloneqq \langle\langle \mathrm{Tor}(G)\rangle\rangle^G$, $\mathrm{Tor}_{i+1}(G) \coloneqq \langle\langle\ \{g \in G \mid g\,\mathrm{Tor}_i(G) \in \mathrm{Tor}\left(G/\mathrm{Tor}_i(G)\right)\}\ \rangle\rangle^G$. By construction, $\mathrm{Tor}_i(G) \subseteq \mathrm{Tor}_j(G)$ whenever $i \leq j$. Now take $\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G) \coloneqq \bigcup_i \mathrm{Tor}_i(G)$. It is clear that $\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)$ is a normal subgroup in G, as each $\mathrm{Tor}_i(G)$ is and they are nested. So $G/\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)$ is a group with natural quotient map $h : G \twoheadrightarrow G/\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)$. That it is torsion free is shown as follows: suppose $g\,\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G) \in \mathrm{Tor}\left(G/\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)\right)$. Then $g^n\,\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G) = e$ in $G/\mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)$ for some $n > 1$, so $g^n \in \mathrm{Tor}_\infty(G)$. Thus there is some $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $g^n \in \mathrm{Tor}_i(G)$, and hence $g\operatorname{Tor}_i(G) \in \operatorname{Tor}\big(G/\operatorname{Tor}_i(G)\big)$. Thus $g \in \operatorname{Tor}_{i+1}(G) \subseteq \operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$, and so $g\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G) = e$ in $G/\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$. It follows easily that $G/\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$ has all the desired properties of a torsion-free universal quotient for G. $\square$

Brodsky and Howie [7] define the *torsion-free radical* of a group G, $\rho(G)$, as the intersection of all normal subgroups $N \lhd G$ with G/N torsion-free (the use of ρ in their notation $\rho(G)$ is merely coincidence, and is unrelated to our notation of a ρ universal quotient). It can be seen that $\rho(G)$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$ in the notation of the above proof. They then go on to define $\hat{G} := G/\rho(G)$ as the torsion-free universal quotient of G. Though $\hat{G}$ is easily seen to be equivalent (that is, canonically isomorphic) to our $G^{\text{tor-free}}$, we will insist on using our definition, as it provides greater insight when we explore an effective construction for $G^{\text{tor-free}}$ in the case of finitely presentable groups later in this section.

One may wonder why we have gone to such trouble to define $\operatorname{Tor}_i(G)$ up to $\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$, and why we cannot just use $\langle\!\langle \operatorname{Tor} G\rangle\!\rangle^G$ to define $G^{\text{tor-free}}$. Whereas G/G' is abelian (G' contains all non-trivial commutators, and annihilating them does not introduce any additional non-trivial ones), $G/\langle\!\langle \operatorname{Tor} G\rangle\!\rangle^G$ *need not* be torsion-free, as annihilating all the torsion may introduce additional torsion that was not present previously. Whereas it is possible to prove that $G/\operatorname{Tor}_\infty(G)$ is torsion-free, there are explicit examples of finite presentations of non-trivial groups G for which $G/\langle\!\langle \operatorname{Tor} G\rangle\!\rangle^G$ is *not* torsion-free. We give one such example here, which was developed by the author together with Rishi Vyas.

Proposition 4.10. *Define the finite presentation*

$$P := \langle x, y, z | x^2, y^3, xy = z^6\rangle$$

Then $\overline{P}$ is non-trivial, but $\overline{P}/\langle\!\langle \operatorname{Tor}(\overline{P})\rangle\!\rangle^{\overline{P}}$ is not torsion-free.

Proof. It is clear from the presentation P that $\overline{P} \cong (C_2 * C_3) *_{\langle xy\rangle = \langle z^6\rangle} \mathbb{Z}$; the amalgamated product of $C_2 * C_3$ and $\mathbb{Z}$ over infinite cyclic subgroups. By theorem 2.2, all torsion elements in $\overline{P}$ are conjugate to torsion elements in the factor $C_2 * C_3$. Moreover, $x, y \in \operatorname{Tor}(\overline{P})$. So it follows that $\overline{P}/\langle\!\langle \operatorname{Tor}(\overline{P})\rangle\!\rangle^{\overline{P}}$ has finite presentation $Q := \langle x, y, z | x^2, y^3, xy = z^6, x, y\rangle$, and hence $\overline{Q} \cong C_6$ which is not torsion-free. $\square$

It is not immediately obvious that a ρ universal quotient can always be algorithmically constructed from a finite presentation of a group (nay, it may not even be recursively presentable). However, in some cases this is indeed possible.

Proposition 4.11. *If $P = \langle X|R\rangle$ is a finite (resp. recursive) presentation of a group $\overline{P}$, then the finite (resp. recursive) presentation $P^{\text{ab}} := \langle X|R,\ [x_i, x_j]\ \forall x_i, x_j \in X\rangle$ is a presentation for $\overline{P}^{\text{ab}}$, uniformly constructible from P.*

Proof. This is immediately seen to be algorithmically constructible from P by adding the finite set of relators $\{[x_i, x_j] \mid x_i, x_j \in X\}$ to P. By construction, $\overline{P^{\text{ab}}} \cong \overline{P}^{\text{ab}}$. $\square$

In a similar way, we show the following:

Proposition 4.12. *If* $P = \langle X|R\rangle$ *is a recursive presentation of a group* $\overline{P}$*, then the recursive presentation* $P^{\text{k-tor}} := \langle X|R,\ w^k\ \forall w \in X^*\rangle$ *is a presentation for* $\overline{P}^{\text{k-tor}}$*, uniformly algorithmically constructible from* P *.*

Proof. Since X is finite, the set X^* is recursively enumerable (list all words of length $0, 1, 2, \ldots$ in succession). So the relating set for $P^{\text{k-tor}}$ is indeed recursively enumerable. By construction, $\overline{P^{\text{k-tor}}} \cong \overline{P}^{\text{k-tor}}$. □

More interestingly to us, we observe the following:

Theorem 4.13. *There is a uniform algorithm that, on input of a countably generated recursive presentation* $P = \langle X|R\rangle$ *of a group* $\overline{P}$*, outputs a countably generated recursive presentation* $P^{\text{tor-free}} = \langle X|R'\rangle$ *(on the same generating set* X*, and with* $R \subseteq R'$*) such that* $\overline{P^{\text{tor-free}}}$ *is the torsion-free universal quotient of* $\overline{P}$*, with associated surjection given by extending* $\mathrm{id}_X : X \to X$*.*

Proof. Set $P_0 := P$ for convenience. Enumerate all words $w_1, w_2, \ldots$ in X^*. For P_0, enumerate all words $v_1, v_2, \ldots$ in P_0 which represent the identity element. Begin checking if any non-zero finite power of some word w_{i_1} is equal to some identity word v_j in P_0; if so form a new presentation P_1 by adding the word w_{i_1} to the relating set of P_0. Now repeat this process for P_1, while still running the process for P_0 in parallel. If either process yields another word w_{i_2}, add the word w_{i_2} to the relating set of P_1, and call this P_2. Continue in this manner; whenever any of the parallel processes on the $P_0, \ldots, P_n$ yield a word $w_{i_{n+1}}$, form a new presentation $P_{n+1} := \langle X|R, w_{i_1}, \ldots, w_{i_{n+1}}\rangle$ and begin the process on P_{n+1} as well. Finally, define $P^{\text{tor-free}} := \langle X|R, w_{i_1}, w_{i_2}, \ldots\rangle$ (think of this as P_∞). It is clear that $P^{\text{tor-free}}$ is a countably generated recursive presentation, and has the desired properties. □

Note. We observe that the above proof essentially shows that, given a countably generated recursive presentation $P = \langle X|R\rangle$, the set $S_i := \{w \in X^* |\ w$ describes an element in $\mathrm{Tor}_i(\overline{P})\}$ is r.e., for all i, and uniformly over all such presentations P. Moreover, the union $S_\infty := \bigcup S_i$ is r.e. Then it can be seen that $\langle X|R \cup S_\infty\rangle$ is a recursive presentation for $\overline{P}^{\text{tor-free}}$, uniformly constructed from P.

It is not always the case that one can describe a uniform construction for G^ρ, as the following non-example shows.

Theorem 4.14 (Bridson-Wilton [5])**.** *There exists a finitely presentable group* G *for which* G^{res} *is not recursively presentable.*

Proof. Recall the notation from definition 4.5 and lemma 4.6. The work of Slobodskoĭ [23] has been be used by Bridson and Wilton [5] to construct a finite presentation $P = \langle X|R\rangle$ for which the finite residual $R_{\overline{P}}$ is not recursively enumerable (as a subset of X^*). Hence $\overline{P}^{\text{res}}$ is not recursively presentable. □

At the moment the author is unaware of any other (non-trivial) algebraic property of groups ρ for which all groups admit a ρ universal quotient.

5. UNIVERSAL GROUPS

Definition 5.1. For ρ an algebraic property of groups, we say a finitely presentable group G is a *universal ρ group* if both of the following occur:
1. $G \in \rho$–grp.
2. Every finitely presentable group $H \in \rho$–grp embeds in G.

The motivation for such a definition comes from the following famous result by Higman. We outline a proof (based around the Higman embedding theorem: theorem 2.4), as we will generalise it later.

Theorem 5.2 (Higman, [17, Theorem 2.5]). *There is a universal finitely presentable group. That is, a finitely presentable group into which every finitely presentable group embeds.*

Proof. Take an enumeration $P_1, P_2, \dots$ of all finite presentations of groups, and form the countably generated recursive presentation $P := P_1 * P_2 * \dots$ Now use theorem 2.5 to embed $\overline{P}$ into a finitely presentable group $\overline{\mathrm{T}(P)}$. By construction, $\overline{\mathrm{T}(P)}$ has an embedded copy of every finitely presentable group, since $\overline{P}$ did. □

The above theorem is not merely existential. Using the uniformity of Higman's construction, Valiev [25] produced an explicit finite presentation of a universal finitely presentable group using 14 generators and 42 relators, which he subsequently reduced to 21 relators in [26].

It seems reasonable to ask for which (if any) algebraic properties of groups ρ there exists a universal ρ group. An easy example is free groups.

Lemma 5.3. *There is a universal free group (namely, F_2).*

Proof. Take the standard presentation $P := \langle a, b | - \rangle$ of F_2. Then, for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the set $\{b^{-i} a b^i | 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ freely generates F_n in $\overline{P}$, which follows easily from the normal form theorem for free products (see [16, §IV Theorem 1.2]). □

We now use some abstract formalisation to prove that certain well-known group properties do *not* admit a universal group.

Definition 5.4. An algebraic property of groups ρ is said to be *strongly held* under subgroups if there is some function $f_\rho : \{\text{finitely presentable groups}\} \to \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following two conditions:
1. If $G \in \rho$–grp and $H \leq G$, with G, H both finitely presentable, then $H \in \rho$–grp and $f_\rho(H) \leq f_\rho(G)$.
2. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there is some finitely presentable $G \in \rho$–grp with $f_\rho(G) > n$.
That is to say, $f_\rho(G)$ bounds $f_\rho(H)$ for all $H \leq G$, and there is no global bound on $f_\rho(G)$ over all finitely presentable groups.

Lemma 5.5. *The following are some examples of group properties which are strongly held under subgroups: finite, abelian, solvable, nilpotent.*

Proof. For ρ being finite (resp. abelian, nilpotent, solvable), we simply take $f_\rho(G)$ to be the cardinality of G (resp. free abelian rank, nilpotency class, derived length). All properties are then immediate. □

Proposition 5.6. *Let ρ be a group property which is strongly held under subgroups. Then there is no universal (finitely presentable) ρ group.*

Proof. Assume there exists a universal (finitely presentable) ρ group G. Then $f_\rho(G) = M \in \mathbb{N}$. Since ρ is strongly held under subgroups, there is some finitely presentable $H \in \rho$–grp with $f_\rho(H) > M$. But G is a universal ρ group, so $H \leq G$. But since ρ is strongly held under subgroups, we must have that $f_\rho(H) \leq f_\rho(G) = M$, a contradiction since H was taken with $f_\rho(H) > M$. $\square$

Combining this with lemma 5.5, we get the following immediate result:

Corollary 5.7. *None of the following group properties admit a universal (finitely presentable) group: finite, abelian, solvable, nilpotent.*

Combining several of our previous results, we now give the most striking observation of this work.

Theorem 5.8. *There is a universal (finitely presentable) torsion-free group G. That is, G is finitely presentable, and for any finite presentation P we have that $\overline{P} \hookrightarrow G$ if and only if $\overline{P}$ is torsion-free. Hence the set of finite presentations defining subgroups of G is Π_2^0-complete.*

Proof. Take an enumeration $P_1, P_2, \dots$ of all finite presentations of groups, and construct the countably generated recursive presentation $Q := P_1^{\text{tor-free}} * P_2^{\text{tor-free}} * \dots$; this is the countably infinite free product of the universal torsion-free quotient of all finitely presentable groups (with some repetition). As each $P_i^{\text{tor-free}}$ is uniformly constructible from P_i (by theorem 4.13), we have that our construction of Q is indeed effective, and hence Q is a countably generated recursive presentation. Also, theorem 4.13 shows that $\overline{Q}$ is a torsion-free group, as we have successfully annihilated all the torsion in the free product factors, and the free product of torsion-free groups is again torsion-free. Moreover, $\overline{Q}$ contains an embedded copy of every torsion-free finitely presentable group, as proposition 4.2 shows that the universal torsion-free quotient of a torsion-free group is itself. Now use theorem 2.5 to embed $\overline{Q}$ into a finitely presentable group $\overline{\mathrm{T}(Q)}$. By construction, $\varnothing = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{Q}) = \mathrm{TorOrd}(\overline{\mathrm{T}(Q)})$, so $\overline{\mathrm{T}(Q)}$ is torsion-free. Finally, $\overline{\mathrm{T}(Q)}$ has an embedded copy of every finitely presentable torsion-free group, since $\overline{Q}$ did. Taking G to be $\overline{\mathrm{T}(Q)}$ completes the proof of the first part. The second part follows immediately from theorem 3.3. $\square$

Note. One may ask why theorem 5.8 does not follow immediately from Higman's embedding theorem by taking the free product of all finite presentations of torsion-free groups, and using the fact that Higman's theorem preserves orders of torsion elements. This idea cannot work, as we have already shown in theorem 3.3 that the set of finite presentations of torsion-free groups is not recursively enumerable (more specifically, the set is Π_2^0-complete).

We can generalise theorem 5.8 slightly, to the following extent:

Theorem 5.9. *There is a finitely presentable group G which is torsion free, and contains an embedded copy of every countably generated recursively presentable torsion-free group.*

Proof. By starting with an enumeration $P_1, P_2, \ldots$ of all countably generated recursive presentations of groups in the proof of theorem 5.8, constructing their torsion-free universal quotients $P_i^{\text{tor-free}}$, and following the rest of the proof there, we can construct a finite presentation P of a group that has an embedded copy of every countably generated recursively presentable torsion-free group. □

Following the methods of Valiev in [25, 26], one might attempt to construct explicit finite presentations of the groups described in theorems 5.8 and 5.9.

An important question is whether there exists a universal simple group. We will show that existence of such a group, in conjunction with a result by Miller [17, Corollary 3.14], would imply that the Boone-Higman theorem [3, Theorem 1] cannot be strengthened any further than the result of Thompson [24, Main Theorem].

Theorem 5.10 (Thompson [24, Main Theorem])**.** *A finitely presentable group G has solvable word problem if and only if G embeds into a finitely generated simple group S which in turn embeds into a finitely presentable group H.*

It seems relevant to note the following long-standing open problem.

Question 1. Is it true that a finitely presentable group G has solvable word problem if and only if G embeds into some finitely presentable simple group S?

It is worthwhile observing the following equivalent notion for a finitely presentable group to be simple (for which a sketch of the proof was pointed out to the author by Ashot Minasyan). We first need the following preparatory lemma which is a standard result in group theory, and subsequent corollary.

Lemma 5.11. *Let G be a finitely presentable group, and $\langle X|R\rangle$ be a finitely generated presentation for G, with R infinite. Then there is a finite subset $R' \subset R$ such that all relators R are consequences of the relators R'. Thus $\overline{\langle X|R\rangle} \cong \overline{\langle X|R'\rangle}$, via the extension of the identity map on X.*

Corollary 5.12. *Let G and H be finitely presentable groups, and $N \lhd G$ a normal subgroup of G. Suppose that $G/N \cong H$. Then N is the normal closure of finitely many elements in G.*

Proof. Let $\langle X|R\rangle$ be a finite presentation for G, and $\{n_1, n_2, \ldots\}$ be an enumeration of all words in X^* which represent elements in N. As $G/N \cong H$, we have that $Q := \langle X|R, n_1, n_2, \ldots\rangle$ is a finitely generated presentation for H. As H is finitely presentable, lemma 5.11 shows that there is some finite subset $S \subseteq R \cup \{n_1, n_2, \ldots\}$ such that all other relators in Q are consequences of S. Then N is the normal closure of S in G. □

Proposition 5.13. *Let G be a finitely presentable group. Then G is simple if and only if all of its homomorphic images are isomorphic to either itself or the trivial group.*

Proof. If G is simple, the it is immediate that all homomorphic images of G are either G or trivial. Conversely, let G be finitely presentable, with all homomorphic images isomorphic to G or $\{e\}$, and assume that G is not simple;

we proceed by contradiction. As G is not simple, there is some proper normal subgroup $N \triangleleft G$. By hypothesis, all non-trivial homomorphic images of G are isomorphic to G, so $G/N \cong G$ as N is proper (as an aside, this implies that G is non-Hopfian). Hence we can view the quotient map $\phi : G \twoheadrightarrow G/N$ with kernel N as a non-injective surjection $\phi : G \twoheadrightarrow G$. Since G is finitely presentable and $G/N \cong G$, this implies that N is the normal closure of finitely many elements of G (by corollary 5.12). Now define $N_i := \mathrm{Ker}(\phi^i)$; the kernel of the i^{th} iteration $\phi^i : G \twoheadrightarrow G$ (in particular, $N_1 = N$). It is then clear that $N_i \subsetneq N_{i+1}$ for each i; that is, the N_i's form a strictly ascending sequence. Moreover, by the same argument as for N, we have that every N_i is the normal closure of finitely many elements of G. If we take $H := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} N_i$, then H will be a normal subgroup in G, by the normality of all the N_i's and the fact that they are nested. But by hypothesis G/H is isomorphic to one of G or $\{e\}$. In the case $G/H \cong G$, corollary 5.12 now gives that H is the normal closure of finitely many elements of G. In the case $G/H \cong \{e\}$, all the generators of G would lie in one N_i. So in either case, there exists some finite m such that $H = \bigcup_{i=1}^{m} N_i$, and hence the sequence $N_1 \subsetneq N_2 \subsetneq \dots$ stabilises. But this is a contradiction since the N_i form a strictly ascending sequence. Thus G must be simple. □

Remark. Proposition 5.13 above is also true if we relax the initial hypothesis to include all finitely *generated* groups, so long as we invoke Zorn's lemma: take a proper normal subgroup N of G, which must be contained in some maximal normal subgroup M (by Zorn's lemma). But then $G/M \cong G$, which is not simple, contradicting the maximality of M in G.

Miller [17, Corollary 3.14], building on the following result of Boone and Rogers [4, Theorem 2], showed there was no universal solvable word problem group.

Theorem 5.14 (Boone-Rogers [4, Theorem 2])**.** *There is no uniform partial algorithm which solves the word problem in all finitely presentable groups with solvable word problem.*

Theorem 5.15 (Miller [17, Corollary 3.14])**.** *There is no universal solvable word problem group.*

We now apply Miller's result to conclude with the following observation.

Proposition 5.16. *The existence of a universal simple group implies that the answer to question* 1 *is no.*

Proof. Use theorem 5.15, together with the fact that every finitely presentable simple group has solvable word problem (see [17, Theorem 6.2]). For suppose we had a universal simple group S, and assume that every finitely presentable group with solvable word problem embeds into a finitely presentable simple group. Then every finitely presentable group with solvable word problem would embed into S. But S has solvable word problem as it is finitely presentable and simple, so this contradicts theorem 5.15. □

References

[1] S. I. Adian, P. S. Novikov, *On infinite periodic groups I, II, III* (Russian), Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR. Ser. Mat. **32**, 212-244; 251-524; 709-731 (1968). English transl., Math. USSR - Izvestija **2** no. 1, 209–236; no. 2, 241–480; no. 3, 665–685 (1968).

[2] W. W. Boone, *The word problem*, Ann. of Math., **70**, 207–265 (1959).

[3] W. W. Boone, G. Higman, *An algebraic characterization of the solvability of the word problem*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. **18**, 41–53 (1974).

[4] W. W. Boone, H. Rogers Jr., *On a problem of J.H.C. Whitehead and a problem of Alonzo Church*, Math. Scand. **19**, 185–192 (1966).

[5] M. Bridson, H. Wilton, *in preparation.*

[6] J. L. Britton, *The word problem for groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **8**, 493–506 (1958).

[7] S. D. Brodsky, J. Howie, *The universal torsion-free image of a group*, Israel J. Math. **98**, 209-228 (1997).

[8] M. Chiodo, *Finding non-trivial elements and splittings in groups*, J. Algebra. **331**, 271–284 (2011).

[9] C. R. J. Clapham, *Finitely presented groups with word problems of arbitrary degrees of insolubility*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **14**, 633–676 (1964).

[10] C. R. J. Clapham, *An embedding theorem for finitely generated groups*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **14**, 419–430 (1967).

[11] D. J. Collins *The word, power and order problems in finitely presented groups*, in Word Problems, eds. Boone, Cannonito, and Lyndon, Amsterdam, North-Holland, 401–420 (1973).

[12] A. M. W. Glass, *Partially ordered groups*, Series in algebra Vol. 7, World Sci., Singapore, (1999).

[13] M. Hall Jr, *The theory of groups*, The Macmillan Company, (1973).

[14] G. Higman, *Subgroups of finitely presented groups*, Proc. Royal Soc. London Ser. A **262**, 455–475 (1961).

[15] S. Lempp, *The computational complexity of recognising torsion-freeness of finitely presented groups*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **56**, 273–277 (1997).

[16] R. Lyndon, P. Schupp, *Combinatorial group theory*, Springer, (2001).

[17] C. F. Miller III, *Decision problems for groups-survey and reflections*. Algorithms and classification in combinatorial group theory (Berkeley, CA, 1989), Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ., **23**, Springer, New York, 1–59 (1992).

[18] P. S. Novikov, *On the algorithmic unsolvability of the word problem in group theory*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov **44**, 1–143 (1955).

[19] D. Osin, *Small cancellations over relatively hyperbolic groups and embedding theorems*, Ann. of Math., **172**, 1–39 (2010).

[20] P. Papasoglu, *An algorithm detecting hyperbolicity.* In *Geometric and computational perspectives on infinite groups (Minneapolis, MN and New Brunswick, NJ, 1994)*, volume 25 of *DIMACS Ser. Discrete Math. Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, pages 193–200. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, (1996).

[21] H. Rogers Jr, *Theory of recursive functions and effective computability*, MIT Press, (1987).

[22] J. Rotman, *An introduction to the theory of groups*, Springer-Verlag, New York, (1995).

[23] A. M. Slobodskoĭ, *Undecidability of the universal theory of finite groups* (Russian), Algebra i Logika **20** no. 2, 207–230 (1981). English transl., Algebra and Logic, 139–156 (1981).

[24] R. J. Thompson, *Embeddings into finitely generated simple groups which preserve the word problem*, Word Problems II: The Oxford Book, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, Volume 95, (1980).

[25] M. K. Valiev, *Examples of universal finitely presented groups* (Russian), Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **211**, 265–268 (1973). English transl., Soviet Math. **14**, 987–991 (1973).

[26] M. K. Valiev, *Universal group with twenty-one defining relations*, Discrete Math. **17** no. 2, 207–213 (1977).

Maurice Chiodo
Department of Mathematics and Statistics
The University of Melbourne
Parkville, VIC, 3010
AUSTRALIA
m.chiodo@pgrad.unimelb.edu.au